arXiv:1601.05769v2 [cs.IT] 30 Sep 2016

Can Negligible Cooperation Increase Network Reliability?

Parham Noorzad, *Student Member, IEEE,* Michelle Effros, *Fellow, IEEE,*
and Michael Langberg, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract

In network cooperation strategies, nodes work together with the aim of increasing transmission rates or reliability. This paper demonstrates that enabling cooperation between the transmitters of a two-user multiple access channel, via a cooperation facilitator that has access to both messages, always results in a network whose maximal- and average-error sum-capacities are the same—even when those capacities differ in the absence of cooperation and the information shared with the encoders is negligible. From this result, it follows that if a multiple access channel with no transmitter cooperation has different maximal- and average-error sum-capacities, then the maximal-error sum-capacity of the network consisting of this channel and a cooperation facilitator is not continuous with respect to the output edge capacities of the facilitator. This shows that there exist networks where sharing even a negligible number of bits per channel use with the encoders yields a non-negligible benefit.

Index Terms

Continuity, cooperation, edge removal, maximal-error capacity region, multiple access channel, negligible capacity, network information theory, reliability.

I. Introduction

In his seminal work [1], Shannon defines capacity as the maximal rate achievable with arbitrarily small *maximal error probability*. For the point-to-point channel studied in that work, the rates achievable with arbitrarily small *average error probability* turn out to be the same. Since average error probability is often easier to work with but maximal error probility provides a more stringent constraint that for some channels yields a different capacity region [2], both maximal and average error probability persist in the literature.

For multiterminal channels, the benefit of codes with small maximal error probability may come at the cost of lower rates. For example, in the MAC, the sum rates achievable under maximal and average error probability constraints can differ [2]. While such differences cannot arise in the broadcast channel [3], the MAC with full encoder cooperation[1], or other scenarios that actually or effectively employ only a single encoder, the importance

This paper was presented in part at the 2016 IEEE International Symposium of Information Theory in Barcelona, Spain.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Numbers 15727524, 1526771, and 1321129.

P. Noorzad and M. Effros are with the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125 USA (emails: parham@caltech.edu, effros@caltech.edu).

M. Langberg is with the State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260 USA (email: mikel@buffalo.edu).

[1]In a 2-user MAC with full encoder cooperation, both encoders have access to both messages.



Figure 1. A network consisting of a memoryless MAC and a CF.

of networks with multiple encoders and infeasibility of full cooperation in many scenarios, together motivate our interest in quantifying the reliability benefit of *rate-limited* cooperation.

To make this discussion concrete, consider a network consisting of a multiple access channel (MAC) and a cooperation facilitator (CF) [4], [5], as shown in Figure 1. The CF is a node that sends and receives limited information to and from each encoder. Prior to transmitting its codeword over the channel, each encoder sends some information to the CF. The CF then replies to each encoder over its output links. This communication may continue for a finite number of rounds. The total number of bits transmitted on each CF input or output link is bounded by the product of the blocklength, n, and the capacity of that link. Once the encoders' communication with the CF is over, each encoder transmits its codeword over n channel uses.

In order to quantify the benefit of rate-limited cooperation in the above network, we define a spectrum of error probabilities that range from average error to maximal error. Theorem 1, decribed in Subsection III-A, states that if for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we increase C_{in}^i (the capacity of the link from encoder i to the CF) by a value proportional to the desired increase in reliability, and C_{out}^i (the capacity of the link from the CF to encoder i) by any arbitrarily small amount, then any rate pair that is achievable in the original network under average error is achievable in the new network under a stricter notion of error. This result quantifies the relationship between cooperation under the CF model and reliability. For the proof, we use techniques from [3], in which Willems shows that the average- and maximal-error capacity regions of the discrete memoryless broadcast channel are identical. A similar result, quantifying the reliability benefit of cooperation under the conferencing encoders model [6], appears in Subsection III-D.

Our main result, Theorem 3, considers the case where C_{in}^1 and C_{in}^2 are sufficiently large so that the CF has access to both source messages. In such a network, whenever C_{out}^1 and C_{out}^2 are positive, the maximal- and average-error capacity regions are equal. Thus, unlike the classical MAC scenario, where codes with small maximal error achieve lower rates than codes with small average error, when the encoders cooperate through a CF that has full access to the messages and outgoing links of arbitrarily small capacity, any rate pair that is achievable with small average error is also achievable with small maximal error. Therefore, cooperation removes the tradeoff that exists between transmission rates and reliability in the classical MAC. Thus in our model of rate-limited cooperation, it is possible to obtain the rate and reliability benefits of cooperation at the same time.

Applying the equality between maximal- and average-error capacity regions in the scenario described above to Dueck's "Contraction MAC," a MAC with maximal-error capacity region strictly smaller than its average-error region [2], yields a network whose maximal-error sum-capacity is not continuous with respect to the capacities of its edges (Proposition 7). The discontinuity in sum-capacity observed here is related to the edge removal problem [7], [8], which we next discuss.

The edge removal problem studies the change in the capacity region of a network that results from removing a point-to-point channel of finite capacity, here called an "edge," from the network. One instance of this problem considers removed edges of "negligible capacity." Intuitively, an edge has negligible capacity if for all functions $f(n) = o(n)$ and all sufficiently large n, it can carry $f(n)$ bits noiselessly over the channel in n channel uses. In this context, the edge removal problem asks whether removing an edge with negligible capacity from a network has any effect on the capacity region of that network. Our result showing the existence of a network with a discontinuous maximal-error sum-capacity demonstrates the existence of a network where removing an edge with negligible capacity has a non-negligible effect on its maximal-error capacity region (Subsection III-C).

The edge removal problem for edges with negligible capacity has been studied previously. In the context of lossless source coding over networks, Gu, Effros, and Bakshi [9] state the "Vanishment Conjecture," which roughly says that in a class of network source coding problems, certain edges with negligible capacity can be removed with no consequences. In [10] and [11, p. 51], the authors study the relation between the edge removal problem for edges with negligible capacity and a notion of strong converse. In [12], Sarwate and Gastpar show that feedback via links of negligible capacity does not affect the average-error capacity region of a memoryless MAC. In [13], Langberg and Effros demonstrate a connection between the edge removal problem for edges with negligible capacity and the equivalence between zero-error and ϵ-error capacities in network coding. In recent work [14], Langberg and Effros show the existence of a network where even a single bit of communication results in a strictly larger maximal-error capacity region.

Given that one may view feedback as a form of cooperation, similar questions may be posed about feedback and reliability. In [2], Dueck shows that for some MACs, the maximal-error capacity region with feedback is strictly contained in the average-error region without feedback. This contrasts with our results on encoder cooperation via a CF that has access to both messages and output edges of negligible capacity. Specifically, we show in Subsection III-C that the maximal-error region of a MAC with negligible encoder cooperation of this kind contains the average-error region of the same MAC without encoder cooperation. For further discussion of results regarding feedback and the average- and maximal-error regions of a MAC, we refer the reader to Cai [15].

Other models under which maximal- and average-error capacity regions are identical include networks where one of the MAC encoders is "stochastic," that is, its codewords depend on some randomly generated key in addition to its message. For such codes, the definitions of the maximal- and average-error probabilities require an expectation with respect to the distribution of the random bits. Cai shows in [15] that the maximal-error capacity region of a MAC where one encoder has access to a random key of negligible rate equals the average-error capacity region of the same MAC when both encoders are deterministic. While some of the techniques we use in this paper are conceptually similar to Cai's proof [15], the respective models are rather different. For example, it holds that

stochastic encoders cannot achieve higher rates than deterministic encoders under average error, even if they have access to random keys with positive rates. The same result however, is not true of the cooperation model we study here when the cooperation rate is positive [16]. That is, at least for some MACs, a positive cooperation rate leads to a strictly positive gain. Furthermore, even for a negligible cooperation rate, while we do not demonstrate a gain in the average-error capacity region, we are not able to rule out such a gain using the same proof that applies in the case of stochastic encoders.

In the next section, we formally introduce our model. A discussion of our results follows in Section III.

II. Model

Consider a network comprising two encoders, a cooperation facilitator (CF), a MAC

$$\big(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, p(y|x_1, x_2), \mathcal{Y}\big),$$

and a decoder as depicted in Figure 1. A CF is a node that communicates with the encoders prior to the transmission of the codewords over the channel. This communication is made possible through noiseless links of capacities C_{in}^1 and C_{in}^2 going from the CF to the encoders and noiseless links of capacities C_{out}^1 and C_{out}^2 going back.

Here our MAC may be discrete or continuous. In a discrete MAC, the alphabets $\mathcal{X}_1$, $\mathcal{X}_2$, and $\mathcal{Y}$ are either finite or countably infinite, and for each (x_1, x_2), $p(y|x_1, x_2)$ is a probability mass function on $\mathcal{Y}$. In a continuous MAC, $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, and $p(y|x_1, x_2)$ is a probability density function for each (x_1, x_2). Furthermore, our MAC is memoryless and without feedback [17, p. 193], so for every positive integer n, the nth extension of our MAC is given by $(\mathcal{X}_1^n \times \mathcal{X}_2^n, p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n), \mathcal{Y}^n)$, where

$$p(y^n|x_1^n, x_2^n) = \prod_{t=1}^{n} p(y_t|x_{1t}, x_{2t}).$$

The following definitions aid our description of an (n, M_1, M_2, J)-code with transmitter cooperation for this network. For every real number $x \geq 1$, let $[x]$ denote the set $\{1, \ldots, \lfloor x \rfloor\}$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of x. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, fix two sequences of sets $(\mathcal{U}_{ij})_{j=1}^J$ and $(\mathcal{V}_{ij})_{j=1}^J$ such that

$$\log \left|\mathcal{U}_i^J\right| = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \log |\mathcal{U}_{ij}| \leq nC_{\text{in}}^i$$

$$\log \left|\mathcal{V}_i^J\right| = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \log |\mathcal{V}_{ij}| \leq nC_{\text{out}}^i,$$

where for all $j \in [J]$,

$$\mathcal{U}_i^j = \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \mathcal{U}_{i\ell}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_i^j = \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \mathcal{V}_{i\ell},$$

and $\log$ denotes the logarithm base 2. Here $\mathcal{U}_{ij}$ represents the alphabet for the round-j transmission from encoder i to the CF while $\mathcal{V}_{ij}$ represents the alphabet for the round-j transmission from the CF to encoder i. The given alphabet size constraints are chosen to match the total rate constraints nC_{in}^i and nC_{out}^i over J rounds of communication

between the two encoders and n uses of the channel. For $i \in \{1,2\}$, encoder i is represented by $((\varphi_{ij})_{j=1}^{J}, f_i)$, where

$$\varphi_{ij} : [M_i] \times \mathcal{V}_i^{j-1} \to \mathcal{U}_{ij}$$

captures the round-j transmission from encoder i to the CF, and

$$f_i : [M_i] \times \mathcal{V}_i^{J} \to \mathcal{X}_i^{n}$$

captures the transmission of encoder i across the channel.[2] The CF is represented by the functions $((\psi_{1j})_{j=1}^{J}, (\psi_{2j})_{j=1}^{J})$, where for $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $j \in [J]$,

$$\psi_{ij} : \mathcal{U}_1^{j} \times \mathcal{U}_2^{j} \to \mathcal{V}_{ij}$$

captures the round-j transmission from the CF to encoder i. For each message pair (m_1, m_2) and $i \in \{1,2\}$, define the sequences $(u_{ij})_{j\in[J]}$ and $(v_{ij})_{j\in[J]}$ recursively as

$$u_{ij} = \varphi_{ij}(m_i, v_i^{j-1}) \tag{1}$$

$$v_{ij} = \psi_{ij}(u_1^j, u_2^j). \tag{2}$$

In round j, encoder i sends u_{ij} to the CF and receives v_{ij} from the CF. After the J round communication between the encoders and the CF is over, encoder i transmits $f_i(m_i, v_i^J)$ over the channel. The decoder is represented by the function

$$g : \mathcal{Y}^n \to [M_1] \times [M_2].$$

The probability that a message pair (m_1, m_2) is decoded incorrectly is given by

$$\lambda_n(m_1, m_2) = \sum_{y^n \notin g^{-1}(m_1,m_2)} p\big(y^n | f_1(m_1, v_1^J), f_2(m_2, v_2^J)\big),$$

where

$$g^{-1}(m_1, m_2) = \big\{y^n \big| g(y^n) = (m_1, m_2)\big\}.$$

Note that λ_n depends only on (m_1, m_2) since by (1) and (2), v_1^J and v_2^J are deterministic functions of (m_1, m_2). The average probability of error, $P_{e,\text{avg}}^{(n)}$, and the maximal probability of error, $P_{e,\max}^{(n)}$, are defined as

$$P_{e,\text{avg}}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{M_1 M_2} \sum_{m_1,m_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2)$$

$$P_{e,\max}^{(n)} = \max_{m_1,m_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2),$$

respectively. To quantify the reliability benefit of rate-limited cooperation, we require a more general notion of probability of error, which we next describe.

For $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$, the (r_1, r_2)-error probability $P_e^{(n)}(r_1, r_2)$ is a compromise between average and maximal error probability. To compute $P_e^{(n)}(r_1, r_2)$, we partition the matrix

$$\Lambda_n := \big(\lambda_n(m_1, m_2)\big)_{m_1,m_2} \tag{3}$$

[2]Our results continue to hold for the case where the encoders satisfy individual cost constraints, since the same proofs apply with no modification.

into K_1K_2 blocks of size $L_1 \times L_2$, where for $i \in \{1,2\}$,

$$K_i = \min\left\{\lfloor 2^{nr_i} \rfloor, M_i\right\}$$
$$L_i = \lfloor M_i/K_i \rfloor,$$

and a single block containing the remaining $M_1M_2 - K_1K_2L_1L_2$ entries. We begin by calculating the *average* of the entries within each $L_1 \times L_2$ block and obtain the K_1K_2 values

$$\left\{\frac{1}{L_1L_2}\sum_{\substack{m_1\in S_{1,k_1}\\ m_2\in S_{2,k_2}}}\lambda_n(m_1,m_2)\right\}_{(k_1,k_2)},$$

where for $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $k_i \in [K_i]$, the set $S_{i,k_i} \subseteq [M_i]$ is defined as

$$S_{i,k_i} = \Big\{(k_i-1)L_i + 1, \ldots, k_iL_i\Big\}. \tag{4}$$

Next we find the *maximum* of the K_1K_2 obtained average values, namely

$$\max_{k_1,k_2}\frac{1}{L_1L_2}\sum_{\substack{m_1\in S_{1,k_1}\\ m_2\in S_{2,k_2}}}\lambda_n(m_1,m_2). \tag{5}$$

The maximum in (5) depends on the labeling of the messages, which is not desirable. To avoid this issue, we calculate the minimum of (5) over all permutations of the rows and columns of Λ_n. This results in the definition

$$P_e^{(n)}(r_1,r_2) = \min_{\pi_1,\pi_2}\max_{k_1,k_2}\frac{1}{L_1L_2}\sum_{\substack{m_1\in S_{1,k_1}\\ m_2\in S_{2,k_2}}}\lambda_n(\pi_1(m_1),\pi_2(m_2)),$$

where the minimum is over all permutations π_1 and π_2 of the sets $[M_1]$ and $[M_2]$, respectively. Note that $P_{e,\mathrm{avg}}^{(n)}$ and $P_{e,\max}^{(n)}$ are special cases of $P_e^{(n)}(r_1,r_2)$, since

$$P_e^{(n)}(0,0) = P_{e,\mathrm{avg}}^{(n)},$$

and for sufficiently large values of r_1 and r_2,

$$P_e^{(n)}(r_1,r_2) = P_{e,\max}^{(n)}.$$

We say a rate pair (R_1,R_2) is (r_1,r_2)-error achievable for a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{in}},\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{out}})$-CF and J rounds of cooperation if for all $\epsilon,\delta>0$, and for n sufficiently large, there exists an (n,M_1,M_2,J)-code such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(K_iL_i) \geq R_i - \delta \tag{6}$$

for $i \in \{1,2\}$, and $P_e^{(n)}(r_1,r_2) \leq \epsilon$. In (6), we use K_iL_i instead of M_i since only K_iL_i elements of $[M_i]$ are used in calculating $P_e^{(n)}(r_1,r_2)$. We define the (r_1,r_2)-error capacity region as the closure of the set of all rates that are (r_1,r_2)-error achievable.

III. Results

We describe our results in this section. In Subsection III-A, we quantify the relation between cooperation under the CF model and reliability. In Subsection III-B, we determine the cooperation rate sufficient to guarantee equality between the maximal- and average-error capacity regions under the CF model. In Subsection III-C, we define and study negligible cooperation. Finally, we determine the reliability benefit of the conferencing model in Subsection III-D.

A. Cooperation and Reliability

Our first result, Theorem 1, says that if a rate pair is achievable for a MAC with a CF under average error, then sufficiently increasing the capacities of the CF links ensures that the same rate pair is also achievable under a stricter notion of error. This result applies to any memoryless MAC whose average-error capacity region is bounded. Prior to stating this result, we introduce notation used in Theorem 1.

Define the nonnegative numbers R_1^* and R_2^* as the maximum of R_1 and R_2 over the average-error capacity region of a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF and J cooperation rounds. Each rate is maximized when the other rate is set to zero. When one encoder transmits at rate zero, cooperation through a CF is no more powerful then direct conferencing. Thus R_1^* and R_2^* equal the corresponding maximal rates in the capacity region of the MAC with conferencing encoders [6]. Hence,

$$R_1^* = \max_{X_1 - U - X_2} \min\left\{I(X_1; Y|U, X_2) + C_{12}, I(X_1, X_2; Y)\right\}$$
$$R_2^* = \max_{X_1 - U - X_2} \min\left\{I(X_2; Y|U, X_1) + C_{21}, I(X_1, X_2; Y)\right\},$$

where $C_{12} = \min\{C_{\text{in}}^1, C_{\text{out}}^2\}$ and $C_{21} = \min\{C_{\text{in}}^2, C_{\text{out}}^1\}$. Note that since using multiple conferencing rounds does not enlarge the average-error capacity region for the 2-user MAC [6], R_1^* and R_2^* do not depend on J.

Theorem 1 (Reliability under CF model)**.** *If $\tilde{J} \geq J + 1$, and for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}^i > \min\{C_{\text{in}}^i + \tilde{r}_i, R_i^*\}$$
$$\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}^i > C_{\text{out}}^i,$$

then the $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$-error capacity region of a MAC with a $(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}})$-CF and $\tilde{J}$ rounds of cooperation contains the average-error capacity region of the same MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF and J rounds of cooperation. Furthermore, if for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}^i > R_i^*$, $\tilde{J} = 1$ suffices. Similarly, $\tilde{J} = 1$ suffices when $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} = \mathbf{0}$.

A detailed proof of Theorem 1 appears in Subsection IV-A. Roughly, the argument involves modifying an (n, M_1, M_2, J) average-error code for a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF to get an $(n, \tilde{M}_1, \tilde{M}_2, \tilde{J})$ code for the same MAC with a $(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}})$-CF. Our aim is to obtain small $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$ probability of error and $\frac{1}{n}\log \tilde{M}_i$ only slightly smaller than $\frac{1}{n}\log M_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. To achieve this goal, we first partition Λ_n, as given by (3), into $2^{n\tilde{r}_1} \times 2^{n\tilde{r}_2}$ blocks. We next construct a $2^{n\tilde{r}_1} \times 2^{n\tilde{r}_2}$ $(0, 1)$-matrix, where entry (k_1, k_2) equals zero if the average of the $\lambda_n(m_1, m_2)$ entries in the corresponding block (k_1, k_2) of Λ_n is small, and equals one otherwise. (See Figure 2.)



Figure 2. Left: The $M_1 \times M_2$ matrix Λ_n with entries $\lambda_n(m_1, m_2)$. Right: The $(0,1)$-matrix constructed from Λ_n. The stars indicate the location of the zeros.

Next, we partition our (0,1)-matrix into blocks of size roughly $n \times n$. For each i, let m_i denote the message of encoder i. In the first cooperation round, encoder i sends the first $n\tilde{r}_i$ bits of m_i to the CF so that the CF knows the block in the (0,1)-matrix that contains (m_1, m_2). If there is at least one zero entry in that block, the CF sends the location of that entry back to each encoder using $\log n$ bits. Then encoder i modifies the first $n\tilde{r}_i$ bits of its message and communicates with the CF over J rounds using the original average-error code. As a result of transmitting (m_1, m_2) pairs that correspond to zeros in our $(0,1)$-matrix, the encoders ensure a small (r_1, r_2)-probability of error.

It may be the case that not every block contains a zero entry. Lemma 2, below, shows that if there is a sufficiently large number of zeros in the (0,1)-matrix, then there exists a permutation of the rows and a permutation of the columns such that each block of the permuted matrix contains at least one zero entry. Since the original code has a small average error, it follows that our (0,1)-matrix has a large number of zeros. The proof of Lemma 2 appears in Subsection IV-B.

Lemma 2. *Let $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{m,n}$ be a $(0,1)$-matrix and let N_A denote the number of ones in A. Suppose k is a positive integer smaller than or equal to $\min\{m, n\}$. For any pair of permutations (π_1, π_2), where π_1 is a permutation on $[m]$ and π_2 is a permutation on $[n]$, and every $(s,t) \in [\frac{m}{k}] \times [\frac{n}{k}]$, define the $k \times k$ matrix $B_{st}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ as*

$$B_{st}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \big(a_{\pi_1(i)\pi_2(j)}\big),$$

where $i \in \{(s-1)k+1, \ldots, sk\}$ and $j \in \{(t-1)k+1, \ldots, tk\}$. If

$$\frac{mn}{k^2}\Big(\frac{N_A e^2}{mn}\Big)^k < 1,$$

then there exists a pair of permutations (π_1, π_2) such that for every (s,t) the submatrix $B_{st}(\pi_1, \pi_2)$ contains at least one zero entry.

B. The Average- and Maximal-Error Capacity Regions

For every $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \in \mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0}$, let $\mathscr{C}^J_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ denote the average-error capacity region of a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF with J cooperation rounds. Let

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = \overline{\bigcup_{J=1}^{\infty} \mathscr{C}^J_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})},$$

where for any set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$, $\bar{A}$ denotes the closure of A. Define $\mathscr{C}^J_{\max}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{\max}$ similarly.

We next introduce a generalization of the notion of sum-capacity which is useful for the results of this section. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$. For every $\alpha \in [0,1]$ define

$$C^{\alpha}(\mathscr{C}) = \max_{(x,y)\in\mathscr{C}} \big(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y\big). \tag{7}$$

Note that C^{α} is the value of the support function of $\mathscr{C}$ computed with respect to the vector $(\alpha, 1-\alpha)$ [18, p. 37]. When $\mathscr{C}$ is the capacity region of a network, $C^{1/2}(\mathscr{C})$ equals half the corresponding sum-capacity.

Now consider a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF. For every $\alpha \in [0,1]$, define

$$C^{\alpha}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = C^{\alpha}\big(\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})\big).$$

Define $C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ similarly.

Theorem 3, our main result, follows. This theorem states that cooperation through a CF that has access to both messages results in a network whose maximal- and average-error capacity regions are identical. We address the necessity of the assumption that the CF has access to both messages in Proposition 6 at the end of this subsection.

Theorem 3. *For a given MAC $(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, p(y|x_1,x_2), \mathcal{Y})$, let $\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}} = (C^{*1}_{\text{in}}, C^{*2}_{\text{in}})$ be any rate vector that satisfies*

$$\min\{C^{*1}_{\text{in}}, C^{*2}_{\text{in}}\} > \max_{p(x_1,x_2)} I(X_1, X_2; Y).$$

Then for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$,

$$\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

The following discussion gives the intuition behind the proof of Theorem 3. Details follow in Subsection IV-C. First, using Theorem 1, we show that for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = (C^1_{\text{out}}, C^2_{\text{out}})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}} = (\tilde{C}^1_{\text{out}}, \tilde{C}^2_{\text{out}})$ in $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ with $\tilde{C}^1_{\text{out}} > C^1_{\text{out}}$ and $\tilde{C}^2_{\text{out}} > C^2_{\text{out}}$, we have

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \subseteq \mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}}).$$

Note that $\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ contains $\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$. Thus a continuity argument may be helpful in proving equality between the average- and maximal-error capacity regions. Since studying C^{α} is simpler than studying the capacity region directly, we formulate our problem in terms of C^{α}. For every $\alpha \in [0,1]$, we have

$$C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \leq C^{\alpha}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \leq C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}}). \tag{8}$$

The next lemma, for fixed $\alpha \in [0,1]$, investigates the continuity of the mapping

$$(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \mapsto C^{\alpha}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

In this lemma, C^α may be calculated with respect to either maximal- or average-error. The proof is given in Subsection IV-D.

Lemma 4. *For every $\alpha \in [0,1]$, the mapping $C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is concave on $\mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0}$ and thus continuous on $\mathbb{R}^4_{>0}$.*

By combining the above lemma with (8), it follows that for every $\alpha \in [0,1]$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$,

$$C^\alpha_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = C^\alpha_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

Since for a given capacity region $\mathscr{C}$, the mapping $\alpha \mapsto C_\alpha(\mathscr{C})$ characterizes $\mathscr{C}$ precisely (see next lemma), for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$, we have

$$\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$ be non-empty, compact, convex, and closed under projections onto the axes, that is, if (x,y) is in $\mathscr{C}$, then so are $(x,0)$ and $(0,y)$. Then*

$$\mathscr{C} = \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0} \middle| \forall \alpha \in [0,1] : \alpha x + (1-\alpha) y \leq C^\alpha \right\}.$$

This result is well known and continues to hold for subsets of $\mathbb{R}^k_{\geq 0}$ for any positive integer k. For completeness, we state and prove the general result in Subsection IV-E.

One question that arises from Theorem 3 is whether it is necessary for the CF to have access to both messages to obtain identical maximal- and average-error capacity regions. The next proposition shows that the mentioned condition is in fact required, that is, if the CF only has partial access to the messages, regardless of the capacities of the CF output links, the average- and maximal-error regions sometimes differ. The proof is given in Subsection IV-F.

Proposition 6. *There exists a MAC $(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, p(y|x_1,x_2), \mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ such that for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$,*

$$\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \neq \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

C. Negligible Cooperation

We begin by giving a rough description of the capacity region of a network containing edges of negligible capacity (Section I). Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a memoryless network containing at most a single edge of negligible capacity and possibly other edges of positive capacity. For every $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ be the same network with the difference that the edge with negligible capacity is replaced with an edge of capacity δ. (See Figure 3.) Then we say a rate vector is achievable over $\mathcal{N}$ if and only if for all $\delta > 0$, that rate vector is achievable over $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$. Formally, if we denote the capacity regions of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$ with $\mathscr{C}(\mathcal{N})$ and $\mathscr{C}(\mathcal{N}(\delta))$, respectively, then

$$\mathscr{C}(\mathcal{N}) = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \mathscr{C}(\mathcal{N}(\delta)).$$

We define achievability over networks with multiple edges of negligible capacity inductively.



Figure 3. Left: A network $\mathcal{N}$ with a single edge of "negligible capacity." Right: The network $\mathcal{N}(\delta)$, where the negligible capacity edge of $\mathcal{N}$ is replaced with an edge of capacity $\delta > 0$.

Based on the above discussion, we define the capacity region of a MAC with a CF that has complete access to both messages and output edges of negligible capacity as

$$\bigcap_{\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}} \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}),$$

where in the intersection we place either $\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}$ or $\mathscr{C}_{\max}$ depending on whether the average- or maximal-error capacity region is desired. From Theorem 3 it follows that for every MAC,

$$\bigcap_{\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}} \mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = \bigcap_{\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}} \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \supseteq \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}), \tag{9}$$

where $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$. Thus even negligible cooperation increases reliability. That is, a negligible cooperation rate suffices to guarantee a small maximal probability of error for rate pairs that without cooperation, may only be achievable with small average probability of error.

The reliability gain of negligible cooperation is closely related to the question of the continuity of the capacity region of a network with respect to its edges. Using the ideas discussed above, Proposition 7 provides conditions under which $C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is not continuous with respect to $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$. The proof is given in Subsection IV-G.

Proposition 7. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$. Given any MAC for which*

$$C^{\alpha}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) > C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}), \tag{10}$$

$C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is not continuous with respect to $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$ at $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{0}$.

In Subsection IV-H, we show that Dueck's contraction MAC [2] is an example of a MAC that satisfies (10) for *every* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. This results in the next corollary.

Corollary 8. *There exists a MAC where for all $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $C^{\alpha}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is not continuous with respect to $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$ at $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{0}$.*

For the average-error capacity region of the MAC, less is known. For some MACs and all $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$, the directional derivative of $C^{1/2}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ at $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{0}$ equals infinity for all unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ [16]. The question

of whether $C_{\text{avg}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$, for a fixed $C_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$, is continuous with respect to $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$ at $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = \mathbf{0}$ for such MACs remains open.

D. The Conferencing Encoders Model

In this subsection, we study the reliability benefit of cooperation under the conferencing encoders model [6], in addition to the maximal- and average-error capacity regions of the MAC with conferencing.

Theorem 1 quantifies the reliability benefit of cooperation via a CF. The next proposition does the same for cooperation via conferencing [6]. The proof is given Subsection IV-I.

Proposition 9 (Reliability under conferencing)**.** *Fix $(C_{12}, C_{21}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$. Then for any MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing, the average- and (C_{12}, C_{21})-error capacity regions are identical.*

Let $(C_{12}, C_{21}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ and $\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf}}(C_{12}, C_{21})$ denote the maximal- or average-error capacity region of the MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing. Then for every $(C_{12}, C_{21}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$,

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) = \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}), \tag{11}$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} = (C_{12}, C_{21}) \tag{12}$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = (C_{21}, C_{12}). \tag{13}$$

Equation (11) follows from the fact that for a CF for which the output link capacity to each encoder is at least as large as the input link capacity from the other encoder, the strategy where the CF forwards its received information from one encoder to the other is optimal. Combining Proposition 6 with (11) implies that direct cooperation via conferencing does not necessarily lead to identical maximal- and average-error capacity regions. This is stated formally in the next corollary.

Corollary 10. *There exists a MAC and $(C_{12}, C_{21}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ such that*

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf,max}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \neq \mathscr{C}_{\text{conf,avg}}(C_{12}, C_{21}).$$

We next study the continuity of the conferencing capacity region with respect to the capacities of the conferencing links. For every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, define

$$C_{\text{conf}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, C_{21}) = C^{\alpha}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}), \tag{14}$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$ are given by (12) and (13). Our next result considers the continuity of C_{conf}^{α} for various values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 11. *For every MAC $(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, p(y|x_1, x_2), \mathcal{Y})$, the following statements are true.*

(a) For every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$.

(b) For every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $C_{\text{conf,max}}^{\alpha}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$, and for $\alpha = 1/2$, $C_{\text{conf,max}}^{1/2}$ is continuous at the point $(0, 0)$.

IV. PROOFS

A. Theorem 1 (Reliability under the CF model)

Our aim is to show that if $\tilde{J} \geq J+1$, and

$$\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}^i > \min\{C_{\text{in}}^i + \tilde{r}_i, R_i^*\}$$

$$\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}^i > C_{\text{out}}^i$$

for $i \in \{1,2\}$, then the $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$-error capacity region of the MAC with a $(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}})$-CF and $\tilde{J}$ cooperation rounds contains the average-error capacity region of the same MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF and J cooperation rounds. In addition, here we show that if for $i \in \{1,2\}$, $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}^i > R_i^*$, $\tilde{J} = 1$ suffices. Similarly, $\tilde{J} = 1$ suffices when $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} = \mathbf{0}$. Also recall R_1^* and R_2^* are defined as the maximum of R_1 and R_2 over the capacity region of a MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF and J cooperation rounds. Our proof follows [3], where Willems proves that the maximal- and average-error capacity regions of the broadcast channel are identical.

Suppose (R_1, R_2) is in the average-error capacity region of the MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$-CF and J-round cooperation. Assume $\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2, R_1, R_2$ are all positive. We discuss the case where some of these quantities are zero at the end of this subsection. Fix $\epsilon, \delta > 0$. Then for sufficiently large N and any $n > N$, there exists an (n, M_1, M_2, J)-code such that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\log \left|\mathcal{U}_i^J\right| \leq nC_{\text{in}}^i \tag{15}$$

$$\log \left|\mathcal{V}_i^J\right| \leq nC_{\text{out}}^i \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_i \geq R_i - \delta \tag{17}$$

and $P_{e,\text{avg}}^{(n)} \leq \epsilon$. In addition, from Fano's inequality it follows that for sufficiently large n,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_i \leq R_i^* + \delta. \tag{18}$$

Let $K_* = \lceil n(R_1^* + R_2^* + 2\delta) \rceil$. For $i \in \{1,2\}$, define $K_i = \min\{K_* \lfloor 2^{n\tilde{r}_i} \rfloor, M_i\}$ and $L_i = \lfloor M_i / K_i \rfloor$. From the set $[M_1]$ choose the $K_1 L_1$ messages that have the smallest

$$\sum_{m_2=1}^{M_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2),$$

and renumber them as $\{1, \ldots, K_1 L_1\}$. Similarly, from the set $[M_2]$ choose $K_2 L_2$ messages that have the smallest

$$\sum_{m_1=1}^{K_1 L_1} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2)$$

and renumber them as $\{1, \ldots, K_2 L_2\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{K_1 L_1 K_2 L_2} \sum_{m_1=1}^{K_1 L_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{K_2 L_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) \\
&\quad \leq \frac{1}{K_1 L_1 M_2} \sum_{m_1=1}^{K_1 L_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{M_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) \\
&\quad \leq \frac{1}{M_1 M_2} \sum_{m_1=1}^{M_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{M_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) \leq \epsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Next, for every $(k_1, k_2) \in [K_1] \times [K_2]$, define $a_{k_1 k_2}$ as

$$a_{k_1 k_2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{S_{1,k_1} \times S_{2,k_2}} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) > L_1 L_2 e^3 \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where S_{1,k_1} and S_{2,k_2} are defined by (4). Let N_A denote the number of ones in the $K_1 \times K_2$ matrix $A = (a_{k_1 k_2})_{k_1,k_2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} N_A &= \sum_{k_1,k_2} a_{k_1 k_2} \\ &\le \frac{1}{L_1 L_2 e^3 \epsilon} \sum_{k_1,k_2} \sum_{S_{1,k_1} \times S_{2,k_2}} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{L_1 L_2 e^3 \epsilon} \sum_{m_1=1}^{K_1 L_1} \sum_{m_2=1}^{K_2 L_2} \lambda_n(m_1, m_2) \\ &\le K_1 K_2 e^{-3}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the last inequality follows from (19).

Next define α as

$$\alpha = \frac{K_1 K_2}{K_*^2} \Big(\frac{N_A e^2}{K_1 K_2} \Big)^{K_*}.$$

Note that α can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\overset{(a)}{\le} \frac{K_1 K_2}{K_*^2 e^{K_*}} \\ &\overset{(b)}{\le} 2^{n(R_1^* + R_2^* + 2\delta) - K_* \log e - 2 \log K_*} \overset{(c)}{<} 1, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (20), (b) follows from (18) and the fact that $K_i \le M_i$, and (c) follows from the fact that $K_* = \lceil n(R_1 + R_2 + 2\delta) \rceil$. Thus by Lemma 2, there exist permutations π_1 and π_2 on the sets $[K_1]$ and $[K_2]$, respectively, such that if we partition the matrix $(a_{\pi_1(k_1)\pi_2(k_2)})$ into blocks of size $K_* \times K_*$, then there is at least one zero in each block. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, define

$$K_i^* = \lfloor K_i / K_* \rfloor.$$

Note that the partition of the matrix $(a_{\pi_1(k_1)\pi_2(k_2)})$ contains at least $K_1^* \times K_2^*$ blocks.

Next we use the partition defined above to construct a coding strategy that achieves a rate pair sufficiently close to (R_1, R_2) under $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$-error. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, encoder i splits its message as $m_i = (k_i, \ell_i) \in [K_i] \times [L_i]$ and sends k_i to the CF. Let $(\pi_1(k_1^*), \pi_2(k_2^*))$ be the good entry in the $K_* \times K_*$ block containing the pair $(\pi_1(k_1), \pi_2(k_2))$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the CF sends the difference $\pi_i(k_i^*) - \pi_i(k_i)$ (mod K_*) back to encoder i. Encoder 1 and encoder 2 then use the original average-error code with J rounds of cooperation to transmit the message pair (m_1^*, m_2^*) where for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $m_i^* = (\pi_i(k_i^*), \ell_i)$. By combining (15), (16), and the fact that $K_i \le K_* 2^{n\tilde{r}_i}$, we see that for sufficiently large n,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{U}_i^J| K_i &\le C_{\text{in}}^i + \tilde{r}_i + \frac{1}{n} \log(1 + n(R_1^* + R_2^* + 2\delta)) < \tilde{C}_{\text{in}}^i \\ \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{V}_i^J| K_* &\le C_{\text{out}}^i + \frac{1}{n} \log(1 + n(R_1^* + R_2^* + 2\delta)) < \tilde{C}_{\text{out}}^i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the rate achieved by encoder i under an $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$ notion of error is at least as large as

$$\frac{1}{n}\log K_i^* L_i = \frac{1}{n}\log \Big\lfloor \frac{K_i}{K_*} \Big\rfloor \Big\lfloor \frac{M_i}{K_i} \Big\rfloor.$$

We next find a lower bound for the above expression. If $\tilde{r}_i < R_i$, then for sufficiently large n, $K_i = K_* \lfloor 2^{n\tilde{r}_i} \rfloor$, and the above quantity is at least as large as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}\log\big(2^{n\tilde{r}_i}-1\big)\Big(\frac{1}{K_*}2^{n(R_i-\delta-\tilde{r}_i)}-1\Big) \\
&\quad \geq R_i - \delta + \frac{1}{n}\log\big(1-2^{-n\tilde{r}_i}\big)\Big(\frac{1}{n(R_1^*+R_2^*+2\delta)+1} - 2^{-n(R_i-\delta-\tilde{r}_i)}\Big) \\
&\quad > R_i - 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\tilde{r}_i \geq R_i$, then for sufficiently large n, $K_i \geq 2^{n(R_i-\delta)}$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}\log \Big\lfloor \frac{K_i}{K_*} \Big\rfloor \Big\lfloor \frac{M_i}{K_i} \Big\rfloor &\geq \frac{1}{n}\log \Big\lfloor \frac{K_i}{K_*} \Big\rfloor \\
&\geq \frac{1}{n}\log\Big(\frac{2^{n(R_i-\delta)}}{1+n(R_1^*+R_2^*+2\delta)}-1\Big) \\
&= R_i - \delta + \frac{1}{n}\log\Big(\frac{1}{1+n(R_1^*+R_2^*+2\delta)} - 2^{-n(R_i-\delta)}\Big) \\
&> R_i - 2\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

If for $i \in \{1,2\}$, $C_{\text{in}}^i > R_i^*$, encoder i can send m_i directly to the CF. The CF computes (m_1^*, m_2^*) and sends its corresponding output from the original average-error code, in addition to $\pi_i(k_i^*) - \pi_i(k_i) \pmod{K_*}$, back to encoder i. Thus a single round of cooperation suffices in this case.

On the other hand, when $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} = \mathbf{0}$, no cooperation is possible in the original average-error code. This means that in the new code, we only need the first cooperation round to guarantee small $(\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$-error. Thus it suffices to have $\tilde{J} = 1$.

When either $\min\{\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2\} = 0$ or $\min\{R_1, R_2\} = 0$, we apply a similar argument, but instead of using Lemma 2, we use its corresponding vector version, which we state below.

Lemma 12 (Vector Version)**.** *Let $A = (a_i)_{i=1}^m$ be a $(0,1)$-vector and let N_A denote the number of ones in A, that is,*

$$N_A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i.$$

Suppose k is a positive integer smaller or equal to m. For any permutation π on $[m]$ and $s \in [\frac{m}{k}]$, let $B_s(\pi)$ denote the vector

$$B_s(\pi) = \big(a_{\pi(i)}\big)_{i=(s-1)k+1}^{sk},$$

If

$$\frac{m}{k}\Big(\frac{N_A e}{m}\Big)^k < 1,$$

then there exists a permutation π such that for every $s \in [\frac{m}{k}]$, the vector $B_s(\pi)$ contains at least one zero.

B. Lemma 2 (Existence of good permutations)

Let $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{m,n}$ be a $(0,1)$-matrix. We apply the probabilistic method. Let Π_1 and Π_2 be independent and uniformly distributed random variables on the set of all permutations of $[m]$ and $[n]$, respectively. Let N_A denote the number of ones in A, that is,

$$N_A = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}.$$

For $(s,t) \in [\frac{m}{k}] \times [\frac{n}{k}]$, define the $k \times k$ matrix $B_{st}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2)$ as

$$B_{st}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) = \big(a_{\Pi_1(i)\Pi_2(j)}\big),$$

where $i \in \{(s-1)k+1, \ldots, sk\}$ and $j \in \{(t-1)k+1, \ldots, tk\}$. Let J_k denote the $k \times k$ matrix consisting of all ones. By the union bound,

$$\Pr\Big\{\exists (s,t) : B_{st}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) = J_k\Big\} \le \frac{mn}{k^2} \Pr\big\{B_{11}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) = J_k\big\}. \tag{21}$$

We next find an upper bound for $\Pr\{B_{11}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) = J_k\}$. Consider the pairs (S_1, S_2) and (τ_1, τ_2), where $S_1 \subseteq [m]$, $S_2 \subseteq [n]$, $|S_1| = |S_2| = k$, and τ_1 and τ_2 are permutations on the set $[k]$. In addition, denote the elements of S_1 and S_2 with

$$S_1 = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$$
$$S_2 = \{j_1, \ldots, j_k\}.$$

Define $E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}$ as the event where for all $\ell \in [k]$, $\Pi_1(\ell) = i_{\tau_1(\ell)}$ and $\Pi_2(\ell) = j_{\tau_2(\ell)}$. In other words, when $E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}$ occurs, $B_{11}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2)$ is a (permuted) submatrix of A with row indices $(i_{\tau_1(\ell)})_{\ell \in [k]}$ and column indices $(j_{\tau_2(\ell)})_{\ell \in [k]}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\big\{B_{11} = J_k\big\} &\le \Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{\Pi_1(\ell)\Pi_2(\ell)} = 1\Big\} \\
&= \sum_{S_1, S_2, \tau_1, \tau_2} \Pr\big(E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}\big) \Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{\Pi_1(\ell)\Pi_2(\ell)} = 1 \Big| E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\big(E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}\big) &= \Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : \Pi_1(\ell) = i_{\tau_1(\ell)}, \Pi_2(\ell) = j_{\tau_2(\ell)}\Big\} \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : \Pi_1(\ell) = i_{\tau_1(\ell)}\Big\} \times \Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : \Pi_2(\ell) = j_{\tau_2(\ell)}\Big\} \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \frac{(m-k)!}{m!} \times \frac{(n-k)!}{n!} = \frac{1}{(k!)^2 \binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{k}},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the independence of Π_1 and Π_2, and (b) follows from the fact that Π_1 and Π_2 are uniformly distributed. Furthermore,

$$\Pr\Big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{\Pi_1(\ell)\Pi_2(\ell)} = 1 \Big| E_{S_1 S_2}^{\tau_1 \tau_2}\Big\} = \mathbf{1}\big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{i_{\tau_1(\ell)} j_{\tau_2(\ell)}} = 1\big\}.$$

Thus

$$\Pr\big\{B_{11} = J_k\big\} \le \frac{1}{(k!)^2 \binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{S_1, S_2} \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2} \mathbf{1}\big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{i_{\tau_1(\ell)} j_{\tau_2(\ell)}} = 1\big\},$$

Note that for a fixed pair (S_1, S_2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\tau_1}\sum_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}\big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{i_{\tau_1(\ell)}j_{\tau_2(\ell)}} = 1\big\} \\
&\quad = \sum_{\tau_1}\sum_{\tau_2}\mathbf{1}\big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{i_{(\tau_1\circ\tau_2^{-1})(\ell)}j_\ell} = 1\big\} \\
&\quad = k!\sum_{\tau}\mathbf{1}\big\{\forall \ell \in [k] : a_{i_{\tau(\ell)}j_\ell} = 1\big\}
\end{aligned}$$

which equals $k!$ times the number of k-subsets of $S_1 \times S_2$ that consist only of ones and have exactly one entry in each row and each column. Summing over all S_1 and S_2, we see that that the total number of such subsets is bounded from above by $\binom{N_A}{k}$. Thus

$$\Pr\big\{B_{11} = J_k\big\} \le \frac{k!\binom{N_A}{k}}{(k!)^2\binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{k}} = \frac{\binom{N_A}{k}}{k!\binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{k}}. \tag{22}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\Big\{\exists (s,t) : B_{st}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) = J_k\Big\} &\overset{(a)}{\le} \frac{mn}{k^2} \times \frac{\binom{N_A}{k}}{k!\binom{m}{k}\binom{n}{k}} \\
&\overset{(b)}{\le} \frac{mn}{k^2} \times \frac{\big(\frac{N_A e}{k}\big)^k}{\big(\frac{m}{e}\big)^k\big(\frac{n}{k}\big)^k} \\
&= \frac{mn}{k^2}\Big(\frac{N_A e^2}{mn}\Big)^k,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from combining (21) and (22), and (b) follows from Lemma 13 [19, Appendix C.1] which is stated below.

Lemma 13. *For integers k and n that satisfy $1 \le k \le n$, we have*

$$\big(\frac{n}{k}\big)^k \le \frac{1}{k!}\big(\frac{n}{e}\big)^k \le \binom{n}{k} \le \big(\frac{ne}{k}\big)^k.$$

C. Theorem 3 (Average- and maximal-error capacity regions under CF model)

Let $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} = (C^1_{\text{out}}, C^2_{\text{out}})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}} = (\tilde{C}^1_{\text{out}}, \tilde{C}^2_{\text{out}})$ be elements of $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ such that for $i \in \{1,2\}$, $\tilde{C}^i_{\text{out}} > C^i_{\text{out}}$. In Theorem 1, for $i \in \{1,2\}$, set $\tilde{C}^i_{\text{in}} = C^i_{\text{in}} = C^{*i}_{\text{in}} > R^*_i$ and $\tilde{r}_i > R^*_i$. Then

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \subseteq \mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}}).$$

Thus for every $\alpha \in [0,1]$,

$$C^\alpha_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \le C^\alpha_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \le C^\alpha_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{out}}).$$

Since by Theorem 14, $C^\alpha_{\max}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^4_{>0}$, taking the limits $\tilde{C}^1_{\text{out}} \to (C^1_{\text{out}})^+$ and $\tilde{C}^2_{\text{out}} \to (C^2_{\text{out}})^+$, results in

$$C^\alpha_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = C^\alpha_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

Since this result holds for every $\alpha \in [0,1]$, by Theorem 5 it follows that for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$,

$$\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) = \mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}^*_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}).$$

D. Lemma 4 (Concavity and continuity of C^α)

We first show that $\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is concave with respect to $(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ for both maximal- and average-error. This result was originally stated for the average-error capacity region in [5].

Lemma 14. *For every $(\mathbf{C}^a_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^a_{\text{out}})$ and $(\mathbf{C}^b_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}})$ in $\mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0}$ and $\mu \in [0,1]$, define $(\mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{out}})$ as*

$$(\mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{out}}) = \mu(\mathbf{C}^a_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}}) + (1-\mu)(\mathbf{C}^b_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}}).$$

Then

$$\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{out}}) \supseteq \mu\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^a_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}}) + (1-\mu)\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^b_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}}),$$

where $\mathscr{C}$ denotes the average- or maximal-error capacity region on both sides of the equation.

Proof. Our proof is via time-sharing. Consider two sequences of codes that achieve the rate pairs $(R_{1a}, R_{2a}) \in \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^a_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^a_{\text{out}})$ and $(R_{1b}, R_{2b}) \in \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}^b_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}})$, respectively. Fix $\mu \in [0,1]$. Set $k = \lfloor n\mu \rfloor$ and $\ell = \lfloor n(1-\mu) \rfloor$. Our aim is to show that concatenating the code with blocklength k from the sequence achieving (R_{1a}, R_{2a}) and the code with blocklength ℓ from the sequence achieving (R_{1b}, R_{2b}) results in a $(k+\ell)$-blocklength code for the MAC with a $(\mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{out}})$-CF that has small maximal or average error, depending on whether the original codes have small maximal or average error. For $i \in \{1,2\}$, define the message set of encoder i as

$$\mathcal{M}_i = [2^{kR_{ia}}] \times [2^{\ell R_{ib}}].$$

We denote the elements of $\mathcal{M}_i$ with $m_i = (m_{ia}, m_{ib})$, where $m_{ia} \in [2^{kR_{ia}}]$ and $m_{ib} \in [2^{\ell R_{ib}}]$. Note that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_i| = \mu R_{ia} + (1-\mu) R_{ib}.$$

In addition,

$$\lfloor 2^{n(\mu C^{ai}_{\text{in}} + (1-\mu) C^{bi}_{\text{in}})} \rfloor \geq \lfloor 2^{kC^{ai}_{\text{in}}} \rfloor \times \lfloor 2^{\ell C^{bi}_{\text{in}}} \rfloor$$
$$\lfloor 2^{n(\mu C^{ai}_{\text{out}} + (1-\mu) C^{bi}_{\text{out}})} \rfloor \geq \lfloor 2^{kC^{ai}_{\text{out}}} \rfloor \times \lfloor 2^{\ell C^{bi}_{\text{out}}} \rfloor$$

Thus over the $(\mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^\mu_{\text{out}})$-CF, it is possible to transmit the concatenation of the symbols that our blocklength-k and blocklength-ℓ codes transmit over the $(\mathbf{C}^a_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^a_{\text{out}})$ and $(\mathbf{C}^b_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}^b_{\text{out}})$-CFs, respectively.

Using the above construction, we see that the probability of error of the new code when the message pair (m_1, m_2) is transmitted, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{(\widehat{m}_1, \widehat{m}_2) \neq (m_1, m_2) \middle| \text{pair } (m_1, m_2) \text{ is transmitted}\right\} \\
&\quad = \Pr\left\{(\widehat{m}_{1a}, \widehat{m}_{2a}) \neq (m_{1a}, m_{2a}) \text{ or } (\widehat{m}_{1b}, \widehat{m}_{2b}) \neq (m_{1b}, m_{2b}) \middle| m_1, m_2\right\} \\
&\quad \leq \lambda^a_k(m_{1a}, m_{2a}) + \lambda^b_\ell(m_{1b}, m_{2b}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the union bound, and λ_k^a and λ_ℓ^b denote the probability of error of our original blocklength-k and blocklength-ℓ codes when message pairs (m_{1a}, m_{2a}) and (m_{1b}, m_{2b}) are transmitted, respectively. Similarly, the average probability of error can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_1||\mathcal{M}_2|}\sum_{m_1,m_2}\Pr\Big\{(\widehat{m}_1,\widehat{m}_2)\neq(m_1,m_2)\Big|(m_1,m_2)\Big\}\\
&\quad\le\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_1||\mathcal{M}_2|}\sum_{m_1,m_2}\Big(\lambda_k^a(m_{1a},m_{2a})+\lambda_\ell^b(m_{1b},m_{2b})\Big)\\
&\quad\le P_{e,a}^{(k)}+P_{e,b}^{(\ell)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{e,a}^{(k)}$ and $P_{e,b}^{(\ell)}$ denote the average error probability of the first and second code, respectively. □

We next prove the theorem. Let $(R_{1a}^*, R_{2a}^*) \in \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^a, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^a)$ and $(R_{1b}^*, R_{2b}^*) \in \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^b, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^b)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha R_{1a}^* + (1-\alpha)R_{2a}^* &= C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^a, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^a)\\
\alpha R_{1b}^* + (1-\alpha)R_{2b}^* &= C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^b, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^b).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha\big(\mu R_{1a}^* + (1-\mu)R_{1b}^*\big) + (1-\alpha)\big(\mu R_{2a}^* + (1-\mu)R_{2b}^*\big)\\
&\quad= \mu C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^a, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^a) + (1-\mu)C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^b, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^b).
\end{aligned}$$

Now since

$$\mu(R_{1a}^*, R_{2a}^*) + (1-\mu)(R_{1b}^*, R_{2b}^*)$$

is in $\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^\mu, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^\mu)$, we have

$$C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^\mu, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^\mu) \ge \mu C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^a, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^a) + (1-\mu)C^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^b, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}^b).$$

Any convex (or concave) function defined on an open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous [20, pp. 22-23]. Thus for every $\alpha \in [0,1]$, C^α is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^4$.

E. Lemma 5 (Characterization of special regions in $\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}^2$)

Here we prove a generalization of Lemma 5 to arbitrary dimensions. Let k be a positive integer and $\mathscr{C}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}^k$. In addition, let $\Delta_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}^k$ denote the k-dimensional probability simplex, that is, the set of all $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}^k$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j = 1$. For every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in \Delta_k$, define $C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ as

$$C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \max_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathscr{C}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{x}.$$

For $j \in [k]$, define the projection $\pi_j : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ as

$$\pi_j(x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_j, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_k) = (x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1}, 0, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_k).$$

In words, π_j sets the jth coordinate of its input to zero and leaves the other coordinates unchanged. We say a set $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is closed under π_j if and only if $\pi_j(\mathscr{C}) \subseteq \mathscr{C}$.

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k_{\geq 0}$ be non-empty, compact, convex, and closed under the projections $\{\pi_j\}_{j=1}^k$. Then*

$$\mathscr{C} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k_{\geq 0} \middle| \forall \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Delta_k : \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{x} \leq C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right\}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Let $\mathscr{C}'$ denote the set on the right hand side of (23). From the definition of $C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, it follows $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathscr{C}'$. Thus it suffices to show $\mathscr{C}' \subseteq \mathscr{C}$.

Every hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^k$ divides $\mathbb{R}^k$ into two sets, each of which is referred to as a half-space. Since $\mathscr{C}$ is closed and convex, it equals the intersection of all the half-spaces containing it [21, p. 36]. Thus it suffices to show if for some $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_j)_{j=1}^k \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ the half-space

$$H = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k \middle| \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \gamma \right\}$$

contains $\mathscr{C}$, then it also contains $\mathscr{C}'$. Suppose H contains $\mathscr{C}$. Since $\mathscr{C}$ is nonempty and closed under the projections $\{\pi_j\}_{j=1}^k$, $\mathscr{C}$ contains the origin. But $\mathscr{C} \subseteq H$, thus H contains the origin as well. This implies $\gamma \geq 0$.

Let S be the set of all $j \in [k]$ such that $\beta_j > 0$. If S is empty, then H contains $\mathbb{R}^k_{\geq 0}$ and by inclusion, $\mathscr{C}'$. Thus without loss of generality, we may assume S is nonempty. In this case, define $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_j)_{j \in [k]} \in \Delta_k$ as

$$\alpha_j = \begin{cases} \beta_j / \beta_S & \text{if } j \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\beta_S = \sum_{j \in S} \beta_j > 0$. From the definition of $C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, it follows that there exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{C}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x} = C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, or equivalently,

$$\sum_{j \in S} \beta_j x_j = \beta_S C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}. \tag{24}$$

Since $\mathscr{C}$ is closed under the projections $\{\pi_j\}_{j=1}^k$, the vector $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_j^*)_{j \in [k]}$ is also in $\mathscr{C}$, where

$$x_j^* = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } j \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using (24) and the fact that $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathscr{C} \subseteq H$, we get

$$\beta_S C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}^* \leq \gamma.$$

Now for every $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathscr{C}'$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}' = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j x_j' \leq \sum_{j \in S} \beta_j x_j' = \beta_S \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x}' \leq \beta_S C^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \leq \gamma.$$

Thus $\mathscr{C}' \subseteq H$. Since H was an arbitrary half-space containing $\mathscr{C}$, it follows $\mathscr{C}' \subseteq \mathscr{C}$. □

F. Proposition 6 (Necessity of high capacity CF input links)

We show that for Dueck's contraction MAC [2], there exists $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ such that for every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0}$, $\mathscr{C}_{\max}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is a proper subset of $\mathscr{C}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$. In Subsection IV-H, we show that for the contraction MAC,

$$C^{1/2}_{\text{avg}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) > C^{1/2}_{\max}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}).$$

Thus it is possible to choose $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} = (C_{\text{in}}^1, C_{\text{in}}^2) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ such that

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) - C_{\text{max}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) > \frac{C_{\text{in}}^1 + C_{\text{in}}^2}{2}.$$

For every $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{max}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) &\overset{(*)}{\leq} C_{\text{max}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) + \frac{C_{\text{in}}^1 + C_{\text{in}}^2}{2} \\ &< C_{\text{avg}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) \\ &\leq C_{\text{avg}}^{1/2}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ follows from arguments similar to those that appear in the proof of Lemma 11. This completes the proof.

G. Proposition 7 (Discontinuity of C^α under CF model)

Choose $\lambda \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\min\{C_{\text{in}}^1, C_{\text{in}}^2\} > \lambda \max_{p(x_1,x_2)} I(X_1, X_2; Y),$$

and define $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^* = (C_{\text{in}}^{*1}, C_{\text{in}}^{*2})$, where $C_{\text{in}}^{*i} = C_{\text{in}}^i/\lambda$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{C_{\text{out}} \to 0^+} C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, (C_{\text{out}}, C_{\text{out}})) &= \lim_{C_{\text{out}} \to 0^+} C_{\text{avg}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, (C_{\text{out}}, C_{\text{out}})) \\ &\geq C_{\text{avg}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) > C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows by Theorem 3. This shows $C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ is not continuous. Now from Theorem 14, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) &\geq \lambda C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) + (1-\lambda) C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) \\ &= \lambda C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) + (1-\lambda) C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}), \end{aligned}$$

which can be rearranged as

$$C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) - C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) \geq \lambda\big(C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}) - C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})\big).$$

Since $\lambda > 0$, the discontinuity of $C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}^*, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$ implies the discontinuity of $C_{\text{max}}^\alpha(\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}})$.

H. Corollary 8 (Dueck's Contraction MAC)

Dueck's introduction of the "Contraction MAC" in [2] proves the existence of multiterminal networks where the maximal-error capacity region is a strict subset of the average-error capacity region. The input and output alphabets of the contraction MAC are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_1 &= \{A, B, a, b\} \\ \mathcal{X}_2 &= \{0, 1\} \\ \mathcal{Y} &= \{A, B, C, a, b, c\} \times \{0, 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The channel is deterministic and defined by the function $f : \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \to \mathcal{Y}$, where

$$f(a,0) = f(b,0) = (c,0)$$
$$f(A,1) = f(B,1) = (C,1),$$

and $f(x_1,x_2) = (x_1,x_2)$ for all other (x_1,x_2). Dueck [2] shows that the maximal-error capacity region of this channel is contained in the set of all rate pairs (R_1,R_2) that satisfy

$$R_1 \le \log 3 - p$$
$$R_2 \le h(p)$$

for some $0 \le p \le 1/2$, where $h(p)$ denotes the binary entropy function. Thus for every $\alpha \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\max}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) &\le \max_{p\in[0,1/2]} \Big[\alpha(\log 3 - p) + (1-\alpha)h(p)\Big] \\ &= \alpha(\log 3 - 1) + (1-\alpha)\log\big(1 + 2^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}\big), \end{aligned}$$

where the maximum is achieved by

$$p^* = \frac{1}{1+2^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}}.$$

We next provide a lower bound for $C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0})$ for the contraction MAC. From the average-error capacity region of the MAC [22]–[24], it follows that for $\alpha \in [0,1/2]$,

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \max_{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \Big(\alpha I(X_1;Y) + (1-\alpha) I(X_2;Y|X_1)\Big)$$

and for $\alpha \in [1/2,1]$,

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \max_{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \Big(\alpha I(X_1;Y|X_2) + (1-\alpha) I(X_2;Y)\Big).$$

Since the contraction MAC is deterministic, the above equations simplify to

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \max_{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \Big(\alpha H(Y) + (1-2\alpha) H(Y|X_1)\Big) \tag{25}$$

and

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}) = \max_{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \Big((1-\alpha) H(Y) + (2\alpha-1) H(Y|X_2)\Big) \tag{26}$$

for $\alpha \in [0,1/2]$ and $\alpha \in [1/2,1]$, respectively. Let the input distribution of the first transmitter be given by

$$p_{X_1}(A) = p_A, p_{X_1}(B) = p_B, p_{X_1}(a) = p_a, p_{X_1}(b) = p_b,$$

and the input distribution of the second transmitter be given by $p_{X_2}(1) = q$ and $p_{X_2}(0) = 1-q$. In addition, let Y_1 and Y_2 denote the components of Y so that $Y = (Y_1,Y_2)$. Note that $Y_2 = X_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y) &= H(Y_1,Y_2) \\ &= H(Y_2) + H(Y_1|Y_2) \\ &= h(q) + qH(p_a,p_b,p_A+p_B) + (1-q)H(p_A,p_B,p_a+p_b), \end{aligned}$$

where $h(q)$ denotes the binary entropy function

$$h(q) = q \log \frac{1}{q} + (1-q) \log \frac{1}{1-q}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y|X_1) &= H(Y_1, Y_2|X_1) \\ &= H(Y_2|X_1) = h(q), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y|X_2) &= H(Y_1, Y_2|X_2) \\ &= H(Y_1|X_2) \\ &= H(Y_1, X_2) - H(X_2) \\ &= H(Y) - h(q). \end{aligned}$$

From (25) and (26) it follows for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) &\geq \alpha H(Y) + (1-2\alpha) H(q) \\ &= (1-\alpha) h(q) + \alpha \big[q H(p_a, p_b, p_A + p_B) + (1-q) H(p_A, p_B, p_a + p_b) \big]. \end{aligned}$$

If we set $q = p^*$, $p_A = p_B = 1/3$, and $p_a = p_b = 1/6$, we get

$$C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) \geq (1-\alpha) h(p^*) + \alpha(\log 3 - p^*/3).$$

Recall that

$$C_{\max}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) \leq (1-\alpha) h(p^*) + \alpha(\log 3 - p^*).$$

Thus $C_{\text{avg}}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) > C_{\max}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$, unless $\alpha = 0$ or $p^* = 0$ (which occurs if and only if $\alpha = 1$).

I. Proposition 9 (Reliability benefit of conferencing)

Our proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1. However, using results from Willems [6], we get a stronger result than the one obtained by direct application of Theorem 1.

For $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ and $C_{12}, C_{21} \geq 0$, let

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf},(r_1,r_2)}(C_{12}, C_{21})$$

denote the (r_1, r_2)-error capacity region of a MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing. Here we show that if $C_{12}, C_{21} \geq 0$, then

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf,avg}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \subseteq \mathscr{C}_{\text{conf},(C_{12},C_{21})}(C_{12}, C_{21}). \tag{27}$$

Note that inclusion in the reverse direction, that is,

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{conf,avg}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \supseteq \mathscr{C}_{\text{conf},(C_{12},C_{21})}(C_{12}, C_{21}).$$

follows from definition; thus (27) is all that we require to prove equality.

We now prove (27). For every blocklength n and every pair of positive integers (L_1, L_2), consider message sets of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_i = [K_i] \times [L_i] \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\},$$

where $K_1 = 2\lfloor 2^{nC_{12}} \rfloor$ and $K_2 = 2\lfloor 2^{nC_{21}} \rfloor$. We know from Willems [6], that a single conferencing round achieves any rate pair in the average-error capacity region of the MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing. Furthermore, in that single round it suffices for encoder 1 to send the first nC_{12} bits of its message to encoder 2 and for encoder 2 to send the first nC_{21} bits of its message to encoder 1. Thus if (R_1, R_2) is a rate pair in the average-error capacity region, then for all $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and all sufficently large n, there exist encoding functions of the form

$$f_i : [K_1] \times [K_2] \times [L_i] \to \mathcal{X}_i^n \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}, \tag{28}$$

and a decoder of the form $g : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$, with

$$\frac{1}{n} \log K_i L_i > R_i - \delta \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\},$$

and average probability of error given by

$$P_{e,\text{avg}}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{K_1 K_2 L_1 L_2} \sum_{k_1,k_2} \sum_{\ell_1,\ell_2} \lambda_n((k_1, \ell_1), (k_2, \ell_2)) \leq \epsilon.$$

Let S be a subset of $[K_1] \times [K_2]$ with cardinality $|S| = K_1 K_2/4$ containing the (k_1, k_2) pairs with the smallest values of

$$\frac{1}{L_1 L_2} \sum_{\ell_1,\ell_2} \lambda_n((k_1, \ell_1), (k_2, \ell_2)).$$

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $K_i' = K_i/2$. Since $K_1' K_2' \leq |S|$, there exists an injective function $\varphi : [K_1'] \times [K_2'] \to S$. Now consider the code defined by the encoders (f_1', f_2'), where for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$f_i' : [K_1'] \times [K_2'] \times [L_i] \to \mathcal{X}^n$$

maps (k_1', k_2', ℓ_i) to $f_i(\varphi(k_1', k_2'), \ell_i)$, and a decoder $g' : \mathcal{Y}^n \to [K_1'] \times [K_2'] \times [L_1] \times [L_2]$ defined as

$$g'(y^n) = \begin{cases} \big(\varphi^{-1}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2), \hat{\ell}_1, \hat{\ell}_2\big) & \text{if } (\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2) \in \text{range}(\varphi) \\ (1, 1, \hat{\ell}_1, \hat{\ell}_2) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \hat{\ell}_1, \hat{\ell}_2) := g(y^n)$.

Note that when the pair $\big((k_1', \ell_1), (k_2', \ell_2)\big)$ is transmitted using the new code, the probability of error equals $\lambda_n((k_1, \ell_1), (k_2, \ell_2))$, where

$$(k_1, k_2) := \varphi(k_1', k_2').$$

Thus

$$P_e^{(n)}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \leq \max_{(k_1,k_2) \in S} \frac{1}{L_1, L_2} \sum_{\ell_1,\ell_2} \lambda_n((k_1, \ell_1), (k_2, \ell_2)) \leq \frac{4\epsilon}{3}.$$

In addition, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and sufficiently large n,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log K_i' L_i = \frac{1}{n} \log K_i L_i - \frac{1}{n} > R_i - 2\delta.$$

Thus (R_1, R_2) is in the (C_{12}, C_{21})-error capacity region. This completes the proof.

J. Proposition 11 (Continuity of C_{conf}^{α})

First note that the functions $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ defined by

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) = (C_{12}, C_{21})$$
$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}(C_{12}, C_{21}) = (C_{21}, C_{12})$$

are continuous. Thus from the definition of C_{conf}^{α}, given by (14), and Theorem 14 it follows that for every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, C_{conf}^{α} is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$. We next deal with the specfic results regarding $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}$ and $C_{\text{conf,max}}^{\alpha}$.

From [6], we know that the average-error capacity region of the MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing is given by the closure of the set of all rate pairs (R_1, R_2) that satisfy

$$(R_1 - C_{12})^+ < I(X_1; Y|U, X_2)$$
$$(R_2 - C_{21})^+ < I(X_2; Y|U, X_1)$$
$$(R_1 - C_{12})^+ + (R_2 - C_{21})^+ < I(X_1, X_2; Y|U)$$
$$R_1 + R_2 < I(X_1, X_2; Y)$$

for some distribution $p(u)p(x_1|u)p(x_2|u)$. Thus whenever the rate pair (R_1, R_2) is in the average-error capacity region of a MAC with (C_{12}, C_{21})-conferencing, then the rate pairs

$$\big(R_1, (R_2 - C_{21})^+\big)$$
$$\big((R_1 - C_{12})^+, R_2\big)$$

are achievable for the same MAC with $(C_{12}, 0)$- and $(0, C_{21})$-conferencing, respectively. From this result it follows that for every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \leq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, 0) + (1 - \alpha)C_{21} \tag{29}$$
$$C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \leq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(0, C_{21}) + \alpha C_{12}. \tag{30}$$

Since $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(0, 0) \leq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, 0)$, if we now set $C_{21} = 0$ in (30), we get

$$C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(0, 0) \leq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, 0) \leq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(0, 0) + \alpha C_{12}.$$

Thus $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, 0)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Similarly, we can show that $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$, by combining $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \geq C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}(C_{12}, 0)$ with (29). The continuity on $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ follows similarly, and thus $C_{\text{conf,avg}}^{\alpha}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$.

We next prove $C_{\text{conf,max}}^{1/2}$, viewed as a function over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, is continuous at $(0, 0)$. Note that for every (n, M_1, M_2, J)-code for the MAC with conferencing, the set of all messages that lead to the same conferencing output is of the form $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ for some $\mathcal{A}_i \subseteq [M_i]$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This follows directly from Equation (19) in [6]. Now fix a sequence of (n, M_1, M_2, J)-codes that achieve the rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*), where

$$R_1^* + R_2^* = 2C_{\text{max}}^{1/2}(C_{12}, C_{21}).$$

Since there are at most $2^{n(C_{12}+C_{21})}$ possible conferencing outputs, the pigeonhole principle implies that for each $i \in \{1,2\}$, there exists a set $\mathcal{A}_i^* \subseteq [M_i]$ such that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1^*| \times |\mathcal{A}_2^*| \geq M_1 M_2 2^{-n(C_{12}+C_{21})},$$

and the set of all message pairs in $\mathcal{A}_1^* \times \mathcal{A}_2^*$ lead to the same conferencing output. Since for $i \in \{1,2\}$ and sufficiently large n, $\frac{1}{n}\log M_i \geq R_i^* - \delta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\log\left|\mathcal{A}_1^*\right|\left|\mathcal{A}_2^*\right| &\geq R_1^* + R_2^* - C_{12} - C_{21} - 2\delta \\ &= 2C_{\max}^{1/2}(C_{12}, C_{21}) - C_{12} - C_{21} - 2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the code where for $i \in \{1,2\}$, encoder i transmits codewords from the original code that correspond to messages in $\mathcal{A}_i^*$. Then this code has small maximal error since the maximum probability of error over the message pairs in $\mathcal{A}_1^* \times \mathcal{A}_2^*$ is at most as large as the maximal probability of error of the original code. Thus

$$C_{\max}^{1/2}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \leq C_{\max}^{1/2}(0,0) + \frac{C_{12}+C_{21}}{2}.$$

Combining this inequality with

$$C_{\max}^{1/2}(C_{12}, C_{21}) \geq C_{\max}^{1/2}(0,0),$$

implies $C_{\max}^{1/2}$ is continuous at $(0,0)$.

V. Conclusion

Cooperation is a powerful tool in communication networks. In addition to increasing transmission rates, cooperation makes communication more reliable. Specifically, Theorem 1 and Proposition 9 quantify the relationship between the reliability of a network and cooperation rate under the CF and conferencing models, respectively. Theorem 3 states that in the CF model, when the facilitator has full access to the messages, the maximal- and average-error capacity regions of the network are identical, no matter how small the output link capacities of the CF are. This result continues to hold even when the CF output links are of negligible capacity, thus providing a positive answer to the question posed in the title of the paper. Finally, Proposition 7 demonstrates the existence of a network whose maximal-error sum-capacity is not continuous with respect to the capacities of some of its edges. The same question, with average-error replacing maximal-error, remains open.

References

[1] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 27, pp. 379–423,623–656, 1948.

[2] G. Dueck, "Maximal error capacity regions are smaller than average error capacity regions for multi-user channels," *Probl. Contr. Inform. Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 11–19, 1978.

[3] F. M. J. Willems, "The maximal-error and average-error capacity region of the broadcast channel are identical: A direct proof," *Probl. Contr. Inform. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 339–347, 1990.

[4] P. Noorzad, M. Effros, M. Langberg, and T. Ho, "On the power of cooperation: Can a little help a lot?" in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, 2014.

[5] P. Noorzad, M. Effros, and M. Langberg, "On the cost and benefit of cooperation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, 2015.

[6] F. M. J. Willems, "The discrete memoryless multiple access channel with partially cooperating encoders," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-29, no. 3, pp. 441–445, 1983.

[7] T. Ho, M. Effros, and S. Jalali, "On equivalence between network topologies," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2010.

[8] S. Jalali, M. Effros, and T. Ho, "On the impact of a single edge on the network coding capacity," in *Information Theory and Applications Workshop*, 2011.

[9] W. Gu, M. Effros, and M. Bakshi, "A continuity theory for lossless source coding over networks," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2010.

[10] W. Gu and M. Effros, "A strong converse for a collection of network source coding problems," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, 2009.

[11] W. Gu, "On achievable rate regions for source coding over networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Caltech, 2009.

[12] A. D. Sarwate and M. Gastpar, "Some observations on limited feedback for multiaccess channels," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, 2009.

[13] M. Langberg and M. Effros, "Network coding: Is zero error always possible?" in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2011.

[14] ——, "On the capacity advantage of a single bit," 2016. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1607.07024

[15] N. Cai, "The maximum error probability criterion, random encoder, and feedback, in multiple input channels," *Entropy*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 1211–1242, 2014.

[16] P. Noorzad, M. Effros, and M. Langberg, "The unbounded benefit of encoder cooperation for the k-user MAC," 2016. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.06113

[17] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. Wiley, 2006.

[18] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[19] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, 2nd ed. MIT Press, 2001.

[20] R. Lucchetti, *Convexity and Well-Posed Problems*, 1st ed. Springer, 2006.

[21] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[22] R. Ahlswede, "Multi-way communication channels," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Information Theory*, 1971.

[23] ——, "The capacity region of a channel with two senders and two receivers," *Ann. Prob.*, vol. 2, pp. 805–814, 1974.

[24] H. Liao, "Multiple access channels," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Elect. Eng., Univ. Hawaii, 1972.